

Applicants: Bergeron et al.
Serial No. : 10/631,138
Filed : July 31, 2003
Page : 12 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: RTN-204PUS

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 6 to 20, 22 to 37 and 40 to 44 are pending in this application; of which, claims 1, 19 and 37 are the independent claims. Favorable reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Applicants thank the Examiner for conducting an interview on Friday, February 3, 2006. No agreement was reached on the claims. The Examiner did agree that if he found this Office Action response as not placing the application in a condition for allowance, he would have further discussions with the Applicants regarding his rationale.

Applicants acknowledge the Examiner's indication that claims 1, 2 and 6 to 18 are allowable. Applicants also acknowledge the Examiners indication that claims 39 to 44 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the base claim and any intervening claims. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 37 to include the limitations of claims 38 and 39.

Applicants further acknowledge the Examiners indication that claims 23 to 28 and 31 to 36 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to including the base claim and any intervening claims; however, Applicants believe there are entitled to broader claims. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claim 19 to include the features of claim 21 and further amended the claim to more distinctly claim the invention.

Applicants : Bergeron et al.
Serial No. : 10/631,138
Filed : July 31, 2003
Page : 13 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: RTN-204PUS

Claims 19 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by EP 1174306. Claims 19 to 22, 29 to 30 and 37 to 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fryer (U.S. Patent Number 4,538,995).

Claim 19, as amended, is directed to a vehicle. The vehicle includes a body, an engine disposed within the body and configured to move the vehicle, and an integrated operator workspace disposed within the body. The integrated operator workspace includes a base having a first longitudinal edge and a second longitudinal edge. The first longitudinal edge of the base includes a first raised platform. The integrated operator workspace also includes a first operator station located adjacent to the first longitudinal edge of the base and a second operator station located adjacent to the second longitudinal edge of the base. The integrated operator workspace further includes electronic equipment coupled to the first operator station and the second operator station. The first operator station and the second operator station are separated by a first predetermined space for permitting substantially unimpeded ingress and egress of the integrated operator workspace by at least a first user operating at the first operator station and at least a second user operating at the second operator station.

EP 1174306 is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 19. In particular, EP 1174306 does not disclose or suggest that the first longitudinal edge of the base includes a first raised platform as formerly recited in claim 21. Applicants note that the Examiner did not reject claim 21 for being anticipated by EP 1174306.

Fryer is not understood to disclose or to suggest the foregoing features of claim 19. In particular, Fryer does not disclose or suggest an engine disposed within the body and configured

Applicants : Bergeron et al.
Serial No. : 10/631,138
Filed : July 31, 2003
Page : 14 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: RTN-204PUS

to move the vehicle. Fryer describes a trailer without an engine (see FIGS. 1 and 2 of Fryer). Furthermore, Fryer explicitly teaches away from having an engine with the trailer by disclosing that an object of his invention is "to provide a portable computer classroom that is independent of the means for transporting it" (see column 1, lines 41 to 43 of Fryer, emphasis added). Moreover, Fryer also states that his invention is "better than a bus since it can be used if the truck breaks down and must be repaired" (see column 4, lines 27 to 29). Thus, Applicants conclude that it would not be obvious to include an engine in Fryer's trailer nor would it be obvious to combine Fryer with any other art since Fryer explicitly teaches away from having an engine within the trailer. Therefore, Applicants believe that claim 19 is now allowable.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants request withdrawal of the art rejection.

Applicants submit that all dependent claims now depend on allowable independent claims.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Applicants : Bergeron et al.
Serial No. : 10/631,138
Filed : July 31, 2003
Page : 15 of 15

Attorney's Docket No.: RTN-204PUS

Applicants submit that the entire application is now in condition for allowance. Such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

All correspondence should be directed to the address below. Applicants' attorney can be

BEST AVAILABLE COPY